Three or More Consecutive Months During the Engagement Period									
,						Advanced			
	}					Services			
				CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate			
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results			
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -	1						
August 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Ohio	0.9051		<u> </u>			
September		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Ohio	0.8625		_			
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
January 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.3973	-				
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
February 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.4985	_	<u> </u>			
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -	ļ						
March 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.6385	_				
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
April 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.3726					
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -				!			
May 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.3510		_			
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
June 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.5729	_				
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
July 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.8525	_				
		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
August 2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.9183					
September		% FOCs Returned within "X" hrs - Elec Sub - UNE Loop (1 -							
2000	1.23	49 Loops) - < 5 hrs	Wisconsin	0.8759					
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -							
January 2000	1.280	LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	Illinois	0.6446	_				
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		1					
February 2000	1.280	LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	Illinois	0.7241	_	:			
		% POCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -]	ŀ	Ì				
March 2000	1.280	LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	Illinois	0.6605					
	ĺ	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -							
April 2000	1.280	LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	Illinois	0.4225	_				
	ľ	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		1					
May 2000	1.280	LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	Illinois	0.3804					
	İ	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				į			
June 2000	1.280	LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	Illinois	0.5575					
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		1					
July 2000	1.280	LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines)	Illinois	0.8846					

Advanced Services CLEC ILEC Affiliate Result Date Measure Description State Result Results % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -March 2000 1.280 Ohio 0.5985 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) % POCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -April 2000 1.280 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Ohio 0.5167 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -May 2000 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Ohio 0.5680 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -June 2000 1.280 0.4907 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Ohio % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -July 2000 1.280 Ohio 0.8923 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -January 2000 1.280 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Wisconsin 0.5448 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -February 2000 1.280 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Wisconsin 0.6877 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -March 2000 1.280 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Wisconsin 0.6695 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -April 2000 1.280 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Wisconsin 0.3705 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -May 2000 1.280 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Wisconsin 0.4229 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -June 2000 1.280 LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) Wisconsin 0.7452 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops) January 2000 1.281 Illinois 0.8020 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -February 2000 LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops) Illinois 0.5732 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -March 2000 1.281 LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops) Illinois 0.7138 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -April 2000 1.281 Illinois 0.4630 LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops) % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -May 2000 0.3198 1.281 LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops) Illinois % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -June 2000 LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops) Illinois 0.6010 % FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -0.9192 July 2000 1.281 LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops) Illinois

_				CLEC	ILEC	Advances Services Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		0.4503		
January 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Indiana	0.6593		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	l	0.7353		
February 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Indiana	0.7352	-	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -]	0.7354		
March 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Indiana	0.7354	_	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		0.4240		ĺ
April 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Indiana	0.4369	—	_
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
May 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Indiana	0.2813	_	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	l	0.000		
June 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Indiana	0.6093		—
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	.	0.0047		
July 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Indiana	0.9047	_	_
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		0.6370		
January 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Michigan	0.6378		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
February 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Michigan	0.7825	-	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		2 4005		
March 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Michigan	0.6805		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
April 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Michigan	0.4124	_	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	,, , ,	0.2402		
May 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Michigan	0.2693	_	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		0.5600		
June 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Michigan	0.5680	-	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
July 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Michigan	0.9013	- 1	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	0	0.445		
January 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.6667	- i	
- 2000		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	01.	0.7203		
February 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.7303	- {	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -		0.5555		
March 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.5552		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
April 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.4879	_ 1	

	Inree	or More Consecutive Months During the	e Engagen	nent Per	100	1
						Advanced
						Services
				CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results
İ		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				!
May 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.5043		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
June 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.6667		<u> </u>
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
July 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.8895	_	
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
August 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Ohio	0.8702		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
January 2000	1.281	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Wisconsin	0.6491		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
February 2000	1	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Wisconsin	0.7768		
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -			_	
March 2000	i	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Wisconsin	0.6402		
,,,ae., soco		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				_
April 2000	l	LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Wisconsin	0.3591		!
April 2000			** iscousiu	0.5571		_
Maii 2000		% POCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	Wissonsin	0.2617		
May 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Wisconsin	0.2617		- 1
1 2000		% POCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -	Winner	0.5444		
June 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Wisconsin	0.5666		- 1
		% FOCs Returned within 24 Hours - Manually Submitted -				
July 2000		LNP W/Loop (1 - 19 Loops)	Wisconsin	0.9009	_	- 1
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
July 2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Illinois	7.7889		
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
August 2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Illinois	7.8014	_	
Septemb e r		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Illinois	7.0537	_	_
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
April 2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Indiana	6.3306		_
	į	Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
May 2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Indiana	6.9463		
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address		İ		l
June 2000		Verification (seconds)	Indiana	7.2798		
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
July 2000		Verification (seconds)	Indiana	8.4630		ļ

	Imice	or More Consecutive Months During the	T	I CIIC I CI	100	
						Advanced
1					-	Services
				CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
August 2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Indiana	8.5737		<u> </u>
September		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Indiana	8.1093		:
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
July 2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Michigan	7.5543		
		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
August 2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Michigan	10.4174	:	
September		Avg Response Time For OSS Pre-Order Interfaces - Address				
2000	2.1	Verification (seconds)	Michigan	9.6645		
						_
January 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.0393		i
February 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.3010]
					_ 1	
March 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.2085		
1/12/01/2000	3.2	Order Freedrick Hadden Cive Ecops	Induis	0.2005	_	
April 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.2146]
April 2000	3.41	Order Frocess reference from friedright - Order Ecops	minois	0.2140	1	i
May 2000	3.27	Order Decease Decease Flow Thomas INIC Loans	Wineie	0.1563		
May 2000	3.21	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.1363		— i
. 2000	2 22			0.1220		
June 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.1329	- 1	
L.). 2000	2 2-			(0.1550)		
July 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	(0.1750)	- }	
August 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.2237	- 1	
September						
2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.3532	-	
					:	!
October 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.6587	_	
				-		
November 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.6266	_	
December 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Illinois	0.8892	 .	
January 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Indiana	0.0561		

0.0186

Michigan

July 2000

3.27

Performance Measures With Results Not Meeting Parity or Benchmark Standards for Three or More Consecutive Months During the Engagement Period

Advanced Services Affiliate CLEC ILEC Date Measure Description State Result Result Results February 2000 3.27 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.1571 March 2000 3.27 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.4062 April 2000 3.27 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.3621 3.27 May 2000 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.1858 June 2000 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.1843 July 2000 3.27 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.2855 0.2210 3.27 August 2000 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana September 3.27 0.4353 2000 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana October 2000 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.6906 November 2000 0.6563 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana December 2000 3.27 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Indiana 0.8106 January 2000 3.27 Michigan 0.2029 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops February 2000 3.27 Michigan 0.3598 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops March 2000 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Michigan 0.3683 April 2000 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Michigan 0.2963 0.2064 May 2000 3.27 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Michigan June 2000 3.27 Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops Michigan 0.2018

Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops

	1111111	or More Consecutive Months During the	Jingager		100	
						Advanced
						Services
	-			CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	R	Results
August 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Michigan	0.3195	_	
September						
2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Michigan	0.5134	_	<u> </u>
October 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Michigan	0.6991	_	
					_	
November 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Michigan	0.7141		-
					-	_ [
December 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Michigan	0.8295		
2000	3.2	Control of the Contro	- Alleragen	5,557		_
January 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.0267		
January 2000	3.21	Order Freezes refeelt from Hillough - Civil Doops	Onio	0.0207	_	- 1
3000	2 27	Color December 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Ok:-	0.1693		-
February 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.1683	-	
						ŀ
March 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.2658	_	-
						Ĭ
April 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.2994	_	
May 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.1229	_	_
June 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.0754	_	
						ļ
July 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	(0.2629)	_	
August 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.2318		
September						
2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.3622		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			_	-
October 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.4683		1
Set0561 2000	J.2.	C. C. C. C. C. C. C. C. C. C. C. C. C. C	0.110	3.4003		-
) 	, , ,	Onder Descent Day The LINE La	Orio	0.4670		
November 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.4679		-
December 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Ohio	0.8204	_	-
	1					
January 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.0856	_	_

	X 111 CC	or More Consecutive Months During the	Diigagen	ilent i ei	100	
1				•		Advanced
	ļ					Services
			•	CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results
February 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.1687		
March 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.2768		ļ į
March 2000	3,27	Order Process Percent Plow Through - CINE Loops	Wisconsin	0.2708	_	
April 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.3317	_ :	<u> </u>
May 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.2104	:	
June 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.2354	:	Ļ I
July 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.1980	:	
August 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.3068	,	
September					_	
2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.5002		
2000	J.2.	oraci, process process and an arrangement of the second	W ISCOLISIO	0.5002	_	_
0-1-1-2000	2 27	Onder Brown Brown Br. Thomas I INT I ame	Wissessia	0.8351		
October 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.8351	−	
November 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.8185	_ :	<u> </u>
				1		
December 2000	3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops	Wisconsin	0.9457	_ ;	
		% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No		Ì		
October 2000	4c.182	Line Sharing	Illinois	0.3127	_	
		% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No				
November 2000	4c.182	Line Sharing	Illinois	0.3014		}
		% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No				
December 2000	4c.182	Line Sharing	Illinois	0.3066		ĺ
	,	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No				
January 2000		Line Sharing	Ohio	0.5833		
3222. 2000		% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No	J		-	— i
February 2000		•	Ohio	0.2948		
Peditiary 2000		Line Sharing	Oillo	0.2740	-	- 1
		% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops - No				İ
March 2000	4c.182	Line Sharing	Ohio	0.2388		- 1
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				- 1
January 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Illinois	0.9402	1	

Three or More Consecutive Months During the Engagement Period									
	İ					Advanced			
						Services			
				CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate			
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results			
İ		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
February 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Illinois	0.9334	_ :				
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
March 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Illinois	0.8801	_	<u></u>			
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
April 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Illinois	0.7787					
		Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				<u> </u>			
May 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Illinois	0.9468		,			
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
June 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Ninois	0.8151		ļ			
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
July 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Nlinois	0.8942					
7417 2000	44.20		minors	0.8742		<u> </u>			
August 2000	4d.26	% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One Day of Work Completion	Dimaia	0.8989		!			
	40.20		Illinois	0.8989	_				
September		Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Illinois	0.8065					
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
October 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Illinois	0.8464					
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
January 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.9524		<u> </u>			
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
February 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.9297					
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
March 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.8945	_				
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
April 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.9266	<u></u>				
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One							
June 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.9009					
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One			_				
July 2000		Dav of Work Completion	Indiana	0.9072		į			
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One			_				
August 2000		Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.9272					
September		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One			-				
2000	j	Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.8306					
2000			midiana	0.6500	i				
O 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One		0.2111					
October 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Indiana	0.8111	[

						Advanced
		·				Services
		·		CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results
		76 Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
January 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.8976		,
		Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One			-	
February 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.8920	:	<u> </u>
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
March 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.8708		,
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
April 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.8261		<u> </u>
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
May 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.9496	_	
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
June 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.8222		
		Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One			_	
July 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.9087	_	
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
August 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.9230	-	
September		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One		0.7200		
2000		Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.8514	_	
2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	77101112411	0.00	- 1	
October 2000		Day of Work Completion	Michigan	0.8630	_	
Cetober 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	Michigan	0.0050	- 1	
January 2000		Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.9287		
Junuary 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	Oillo	0.9201	- 1	_
February 2000	i	Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.8427	_	
rebruary 2000			Oillo	0.0427	- 1	
March 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	Ohio	0.8866		
IVIAICII 2000		Day of Work Completion	Onio	0.0000	- }	
And 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	Ohio	0.8653		
April 2000		Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.8033	- }	
1 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	OL:	0.0605		
June 2000		Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.8605	-	 !
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One		0.051.5		į
July 2000		Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.8516		 :
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
August 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.8676	- 4	
September		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.7532		

	ı nree	or More Consecutive Months During the	Engager	nent Per	10α	
	ĺ	# · · · · ·		Ì		Advance
						Services
				CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results
	}	% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One		}		
October 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.8385		
	ĺ	% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
November 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Ohio	0.9360		
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One]		
January 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.9087		
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				
February 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.9244		
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	:			_
March 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.9028		
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One				_
April 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.8997	-	
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One			_	
May 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.9320	-	
		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One			- 1	
June 2000	4d.26	Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.8784	_	
30110 0000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	W 13COLISTI	0.0704	- 1	_
July 2000		Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.9261		
3217 2000			Wisconsin	0.9201	- 1	
August 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.9153		
			WISCOUSIII	0.9133	- 1	
September 2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One Day of Work Completion	Wissensia	0.0104		
2000			Wisconsin	0.8104	- 1	
0-1-1-2000		% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One	***	0.0021		
October 2000		Day of Work Completion	Wisconsin	0.8821	- †	_
		% Installation Rpts (Trble Rpts) w/in 30 Days (1-30) of Inst				
June 2000		UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	Illinois	0.1598	- ł	
		% Installation Rpts (Trble Rpts) w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Inst -				
July 2000	5c 197	UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	Illinois	0.1462	-	_
		% Installation Rpts (Trble Rpts) w/in 30 Days (I-30) of Inst -	ļ			
August 2000	5c.197	UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	Illinois	0.1285	-	
September		% Installation Rpts (Trble Rpts) w/1n 30 Days (I-30) of Inst -				
2000	5c.197	UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Share	Illinois	0.1088	_ :	
		Average Delay Days for AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE -		1		
January 2000	7c.212	DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	8.4694		 :
		Average Delay Days for AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE -		1		
February 2000	7c.212	DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	15.0000		

Three or More Consecutive Months During the Engagement Period									
						Advanced			
						Services			
				CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate			
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results			
		Average Delay Days for AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE -							
March 2000	7c.212	DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	9.9750	_ ′	<u> </u>			
		Average Delay Days for AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE -							
April 2000	7c.212	DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	8.6442	_ ;				
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -							
March 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Michigan	5.8083					
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -							
April 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Michigan	6.8549	_ :	<u></u> ;			
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -							
May 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Michigan	6.9186	_ :	<u> </u>			
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -							
January 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Ohio	9.9477					
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -			_				
February 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Ohio	9.5846					
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -				<u> </u>			
March 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Ohio	6.3495		,			
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -			- 1				
April 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Ohio	6.9975		ļ,			
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -			- 1	_ 1			
May 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Ohio	7.8638					
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -				1			
May 2000	8.138	Without Conditioning	Wisconsin	6.6226	:	,			
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -			_	_			
June 2000		Without Conditioning	Wisconsin	7.5421),	,			
		Average Installation Interval - DSL - Without Line Sharing -			- i	- 1			
July 2000		Without Conditioning	Wisconsin	9.9307	ı,				
		Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information -			- 1	- 1			
August 2000		ADSL (days)	Illinois	70.8863	. ,				
September		Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information -	2441045	70,000	_	- 1			
2000		ADSL (days)	Illinois	76.5672	,	,			
2000			11111013	75.55,72	- †	- 1			
October 2000		Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information - ADSL (days)	Illinois	56.0893	5				
OCTOOCI 2000			minois	20.0073	- 1	– 1			
November 2000		Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information -	Tlimaia	34 5245	1				
November 2000		ADSL (days)	Illinois	34.5345	- †	-			
D 2000		Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information -	m::-	20.0752	,				
December 2000	9.166	ADSL (days)	Illinois	29.9763	_ 4	J			

	Three	or More Consecutive Months During the	e Engagen	nent Per	10d	
						Advanced
	İ					Services
				CLEC	ILEC	Affiliate
Date	Measure	Description	State	Result	Result	Results
		Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information -				
August 2000	9.166	ADSL (days)	Wisconsin	68.0699		
September	ļ	Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information -				
2000	9.166	ADSL (days)	Wisconsin	71.8159	<u>-</u>	:
		Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information -				
October 2000	9.166	ADSL (days)	Wisconsin	49.2849	_ _	
May 2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.1126	_	_ ;
June 2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.1074		
July 2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.1031		;
August 2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.0910		
September					_	
2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.0622		
					- i	
October 2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.1196		
					_	
November 2000	110 273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.1192		
2.0.000	1.6.213	Wheeler Reports One Bos Books Two Earle Shalling	11111013		-	
December 2000	110 273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Illinois	0.1174		
Determen 2000	110.275	W Repeat Reports - 6742 - 652 200ps - No Line Sharing	initions	0.11.4	-	
August 2000	11c.273	G. Panest Panests INE DSI Loops No Line Sharing	Indiana	0.0732		
	110.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	шцапа	0.0732	-	
September 2000	11c.273	C. Penest Penests - INIC - DCI 1 No Line Chadre	Indiana	0.0879		ļ
2000	110.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Indiana	0.0879	-	
Ontober 2000	110 272	G. Denset Denset - INIC - DCI 1 No Line Chair	ladi	0.73.		1
October 2000	11c.273	Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Indiana	0.1731	-	_
				0.107.1		j
June 2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	0.1074	-	- 1
						İ
July 2000	11c.273	Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	0.0925	- 1	- 1
August 2000	11c.273	Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	0.0783	-	┤
September				j		İ
2000	11c.273	% Repeat Reports - UNE - DSL Loops - No Line Sharing	Ohio	0.0725	_ 1	

Date	Measure	Description	State	CLEC Result	ILEC Result	Advanced Services Affiliate Results
	•••				-	
SWBT Results						
January 2000	5c-08	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days - UNE - DSL	TX			
February 2000	5c-08	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days - UNE - DSL	TX			
March 2000	5c-08	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days - UNE - DSL	TX			
February 2000	9-01	Avg. Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information	KS			
March 2000	9-01	Avg. Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information	KS			
April 2000	9-01	Avg. Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information	KS			
April 2000	13c-08	Trouble Report Rate - DSL	AR		<u> </u>	
May 2000	13c-08	Trouble Report Rate - DSL	AR			
June 2000	13c-08	Trouble Report Rate - DSL	AR			-

Pacific	Rall	Results
racuic	Den	VENIR

	4d.	#4dAverage Completion Notice Interval - Fully Electronic -	
		Prior to Nov '99 in days / as of Nov '99 in hours - LEX/EDI	
January 2000	1800100	LASR	CA
		#4dAverage Completion Notice Interval - Fully Electronic -	
	4d.	Prior to Nov '99 in days / as of Nov '99 in hours - LEX/EDI	
February 2000	1800100	LASR	CA
		#4dAverage Completion Notice Interval - Fully Electronic -	
	4d.	Prior to Nov '99 in days / as of Nov '99 in hours - LEX/EDI	
March 2000	1800100	LASR	CA

SBC Explanations of Results

		Г	
Measure			
Number	Description	States	SBC Explanation
1.15 1.23 1.280 1.281	% FOCs Returned within "x" Hours	Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin	Measure 1.15 – manually submitted orders improved when the Local Service Center ("LSC") headcount was increased 30% in April-May 2000. PM 1.23 came back into parity in October 2000 when system and process improvements were instituted. PM 1.28 was fixed with process improvements and job aids in October 2000 and also responded to the increased headcount.
2.1	Average Response Time for OSS Pre- Order Interfaces – Address Verification (Seconds)	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan	Response times were shortened and parity was restored when transaction improvements were implemented that affected the Service Address Validation and Living Unit Inquiry/Validation queries.
3.27	Order Process Percent Flow Through – UNE Loops	Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin	Beginning with mid-September 2000 results, a significant percentage of the ASRs that had been counted as Ameritech ILEC misses were in fact due to CLEC errors.
8.138	Average Installation Interval – DSL – No Line Sharing, No Conditioning	Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin	During the first part of 2000, the CLECs were ramping up on DSL volumes. Beginning with August results, the affiliate was removed from the CLEC aggregate and reported separately as the parity comparison, bringing the Wisconsin results into parity.
9.166	Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information – ADSL (Days)	Illinois, Wisconsin	During 2000, both the CLECs and ASI were ramping up on DSL volumes. There were also network initiatives to improve installation and repair service quality results, which included increasing the network force roughly 20%. These initiatives improved service intervals resulting in parity performance.
11c.273	% Repeat Reports – UNE – DSL Loops – No Line Sharing	Illinois, Indiana, Ohio	This is due to the differences in CLEC and Advanced Services affiliate approaches to their installation process. Typically, CLECs order UNEs without having the loop tested for DSL capability, and subsequently submit trouble reports until a technician can get the circuit to work properly. The Advanced Services affiliate's general practice is to order a DSL-capable loop up front.

SBC Explanations of Results .

Measure			
Number	Description	States	SBC Explanation
4c.182	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates – UNE – DSL Loops – No Line Sharing	Illinois, Ohio	Illinois CLEC results were stable, but affiliate performance improved significantly in the 4 th quarter, creating disparity. Ohio results in the 1 st quarter were unstable due to low CLEC volumes associated with DSL ramp-up. Further, most misses are attributable to facility or work force problems on this measure. If the affiliate does more pre-qualification, pre-testing on loops than the other CLECs, this would result in fewer
			facility misses.
4d.26	% Mechanized Completion Notifications Returned Within One Day of Work Completion	Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin	There were three drivers for these results. First, programming changes were required to fix a problem with how files with errors were treated. Second, network process improvements were made in how pending auto complete orders in the Operations Center were handled and the number of network technicians was increased which facilitated more timely completion. Third, the LOC began a detailed daily review of results which revealed manual completions of unbundled loop orders were not being processed on a timely basis. This was fixed by changing the procedures for completing these orders.
5c.197	% Installation Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation – UNE – DSL – No Line Sharing	Illinois	Small volumes cause small differences in performance to result in large differences in Z-scores. For instance in Illinois for May, the wholesale result was .09891937 and resulting in a Z-score of – 1.45147. In Illinois for June, the wholesale result was .15983607 and the resulting in a Z-score of 2.29662. The difference in results for May was .01421932 while the difference in results for June was .02132256, so for .00710324 change in results, the Z-score changed by 3.74809.
7c.212	Average Delay Days for AIT Caused Missed Due Dates – UNE – DSL – No Line Sharing	Ohio	Analysis of existing detailed order data showed that the misses were due to facility issues and work force constraints. Process improvement and increased work force addressed this issue.

SBC Explanations of Results

Measure Number	Description	States	SBC Explanation
13c-08	Trouble Report Rate - DSL	Arkansas	Very small embedded base for wholesale means that a small change in the number of reports produces a large Z-score change.
5c-08	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days - UNE - DSL	Texas	DSL was a new product during the first quarter of 2000, and as such was more likely to require maintenance within the first month after installation. These results are also tied to the pre-testing procedures implemented by the various CLECs.
9-01	Average Response Time for Loop Make-Up Information	Kansas	At the beginning of 2000, loop qualification requests were all manual. Retail submitted theirs via an internal tracking web site; wholesale requests were submitted through the LSC, which in turn entered them into the same tracking system. Beginning in May 2000, due to ongoing mechanization initiatives, loop qualification information no longer required LSC intervention, in turn lowering average response time for the CLECs.
4d.180010 0	Average Completion Notice Interval – Fully Electronic – Prior to Nov '99 in Days / as of Nov '99 in Hours – LEX/EDI LASR	California	Mechanized completions include orders that error out to manual. These orders are more labor-intensive. There was more fallout at the beginning of 2000 due to start-up issues, and this drove the results to be out of parity. As volumes increased, the percentage of orders dropping to manual declined, and the overall results improved. The California PUC has recognized this and approved an additional disaggregation comparing the fallout to a 24-hour benchmark.

PAC Affiliate DS3 Performance Measures #2 Comparison

	Affiliate			\prod		Nonaffiliate	
July	Revised	Original	Difference	\prod	Revised	Original	Difference
DD					96.3%	34.1%	62.2%

	_	Affiliate		J	-	Nonaffiliate	
August	Revised	Original	Difference		Revised	Original	Difference
DD					93.0%	26.7%	66.3%
DD+1	_				93.2%	34.2%	59.0%
DD+2	_				93.7%	38.7%	55.0%
DD+3					93.7%	41.6%	52.1%
DD+4					93.7%	44.0%	49.7%
DD+5					94.0%	47.7%	46.3%
DD+6					94.2%	49.1%	45.1%
DD+7				!	94.6%	50.9%	43.7%
DD+8				1	94.6%	52.1%	42.5%
DD+9					94.9%	54.3%	40.6%
DD+10					95.1%	55.0%	40.1%

		Affiliate				Nonaffiliate	
September	Ravised	Original	Difference		Revised	Original	Difference
DD .	<u> </u>	ı	ı	1	92.0%	28.4%	63.6%
DD+1	-				92.6%	37.8%	54.8%
DD+2	_				93.7%	43.8%	49.9%
DD+3	_				94.6%	48.1%	46.5%
DD+4	į.				95.1%	50.5%	44.6%

SNET DS3 Performance Measures #2 Comparison

	Affiliate		
1	Revised	Original	Difference
JULY 2000			
DD			
DD+1			
DD+2			
DD+3			
DD+4			
DD+5			
DD+6			
DD+7			
DD+8			
DD+9			
DD+10			
DD+11			
DD+12			
DD+13			
DD+14			
DD+15			
DD+16			
DD+17			
DD+18			
DD+19			
DD+20			
DD+21			
DD+22			
DD+23			
DD+24			
DD+25			
DD+26			
DD+27			
DD+28			
DD+29			
· -			

	Nonaffiliate				
Revised	Original	Difference			
66.7%	66.7%	0.0%			
66.7%	66.7%	0.0%			
70.0%	70.0%	0.0%			
70.0%	70.0%	0.0%			
70.0%	70.0%	0.0%			
70.0%	70.0%	0.0%			
73.3%	73.3%	0.0%			
83.3%	83.3%	0.0%			
83.3%	83.3%	0.0%			
83.3%	83.3%	0.0%			
83.3%	83.3%	0.0%			
83.3%	83.3%	0.0%			
86.7%	86.7%	0.0%			
86.7%		0.0%			
	86.7%	•"			
86.7%	86.7%	0.0%			
96.7%	96.7%	0.0%			
					
		1			

SNET DS3 Performance Measures #2 Comparison

		Affiliat	e
	Revised	Original	Difference
DD+30	<u>'</u>		
DD+31	1		
DD+32			
DD+33			
DD+34			
DD+35	1		
) ·	
AUGUST 2000			
DD	, -		
DD+1	=		
DD+2	<u>-</u>		
DD+3			
DD+4			
DD+5			
DD+6			
DD+7			
DD+8			
DD+9			
DD+10			
DD+11			
DD+12			
DD+13			
DD+14			
DD+15			
DD+16			
DD+17			
DD+18			
DD+19			
DD+20			
DD+21			
DD+22			

	Nonaffiliate				
Revised	Original	Difference			
89.4%	82.4%	7.0%			
89.4%	82.4%	7.0%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
91.5%	88.2%	3.3%			
93.6%	88.2%	5.4%			
93.6%	94.1%	-0.5%			
93.6%	94.1%	-0.5%			
93.6%	94.1%	-0.5%			

SNET DS3 Performance Measures #2 Comparison

	Affiliate		
	Revised	Original	Difference
DD+23			_
DD+24			-
DD+25			_
DD+26			_
DD+27			_
SEPTEMBER 2000			
DD			
DD+1			
DD+2			
DD+3			
DD+4			
DD+5			
DD+6			
DD+7			
DD+8			
DD+9			
DD+10			
DD+11			
DD+12			
DD+13			
DD+14			
DD+15			
DD+16			
DD+17			
DD+18			
DD+19			
DD+20			
DD+21			
DD+22			
DD+23			ı

Nonaffiliate							
	Original						
93.6%	94.1%	-0.5%					
93.6%	94.1%	-0.5%					
93.6%	94.1%	-0.5%					
93.6%	94.1%	-0.5%					
95.7%	94.1%	1.6%					
67.7%	62.5%	5.2%					
67.7%	62.5%	5.2%					
67.7%	62.5%	5.2%					
67.7%	62.5%	5.2%					
67.7%	62.5%	5.2%					
71.0%	62.5%	8.5%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
74.2%	68.8%	5.4%					
77.4%	68.8%	8.7%					
77.4%	68.8%	8.7%					
77.4%	68.8%	8.7%					
80.6%	75.0%	5.6%					
80.6%	75.0%	5.6%					
80.6%	75.0%	5.6%					
80.6%	75.0%	5.6%					
80.6%	75.0%	5.6%					
83.9%	75.0%	8.9%					

SNET DS3 Performance Measures #2 Comparison

		Affiliat	e
	Revised	Original	Difference
DD+24	i	ļ	•
DD+25			
DD+26			
DD+27			
DD+28			
DD+29			
DD+30			
DD+31			
DD+32			
DD+33			
DD+34			
DD+35			
DD+36			
DD+37			
DD+38			
DD+39			
DD+40			

	Nonaffiliate							
Revised	Original	Difference						
83.9%	81.3%	2.6%						
83.9%	81.3%	2.6%						
83.9%	81.3%	2.6%						
83.9%	81.3%	2.6%						
83.9%	81.3%	2.6%						
83.9%	81.3%	2.6%						
83.9%	81.3%	2.6%						
87.1%	81.3%	5.8%						
87.1%	81.3%	5.8%						
87.1%	81.3%	5.8%						
87.1%	81.3%	5.8%						
87.1%	81.3%	5.8%						
93.5%	81.3%	12.3%						
93.5%	81.3%	12.3%						
93.5%	81.3%	12.3%						
93.5%	81.3%	12.3%						
96.8%	81.3%	15.5%						

Billing & Collection Contract Rates

SWBT			Unaffiliated Carriers			
		ASI				
Bill rendering - Message Bill	01/01/00 - 11/19/00	\$0.40	\$0.35	\$0.35	\$0.35	\$ 0.35
	11/20/00 - 12/31/00	0.61	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35
Bill rendering - Invoice Billing	lst page	1.20	0.50	ND	ND	ND
	each subsequent page	0.60	0.30	ND	ND	ND
End user adjustment manual		9.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Development charge		150.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00
Monthly minimum purchase of				ļ		
service		\$12,000	\$16.667	\$ 13.333	\$16,667	\$16.667

Pacific Bell			
		ASI	
		Standard 3	year price
	Average over 20		
Message Bill processing	messages per bill	\$0.03	\$0.00
	Average over 30		
	messages per bill	0.03	0.00
		Volume d	iscount
Bill rendering - account ready	lst page	\$0.65	\$0.80
	Each subsequent page	0.20	0.30
Development charge		150.00	120.00

			Unaffiliated Co	urriers	
Nevada Bell		İ	ļ	ŀ	
	ASI				
Bill rendering - message bill	\$0.74	\$0.70	\$0.70	\$0.70	\$0.70
Record keeping maintenance	0.03	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.10
Development charge	\$150.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00

SNET			,			
	ASI	-				
Bill processing per message	\$ 0.11	\$0.06	\$0.11	\$0.06	\$0.06	\$0.11
Bill processing per bill rendered	0.55	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51
Receipt of rated customer message via CMDS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Receipt of rated customer message via NDM	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Program development per hour	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00
Report Processing Charges						
Tape Reports	65.79	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Cartridge	43.80	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Paper. NDM	no charge	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND_
TERMINATION: written notice required	3 months	6 months	6 months	6 months	6 months	6 months

ND-Not defined in the agreement

Objective IX-4 Comparison of USOCs and Rate Comparison Summary of Differences

			ASI/AADS		CLEC
State	Month	USOC	Rate	CLEC Name	Rate
Arkansas	September 2000	U2F	\$ 31.60		
Oklahoma	September 2000	U2F	18.00		1
Texas	June 2000	U2F	12.14		
Texas	June 2000	U2F	13.65		_
Texas	June 2000	U2Q	34.91		:
Texas	June 2000	U2Q	34.91		
Texas	June 2000	U2Q	34.91		i
Texas	June 2000	U2Q	34.91		
Texas	June 2000	UXRRX	0.60		
Texas	June 2000	UXRRX	0.60		
Texas	September 2000	U2F	12.14		
Texas	September 2000	U2F	13.65		
Texas	September 2000	U2Q	34.91		
				•	
Texas	September 2000	U2Q	34.91		
Texas	September 2000	UXRRX	0.60		.]
Texas	September 2000	UXRRX	0.60]
California	September 2000	CCDSO	_]
California	September 2000	CCDSO	_		
California	September 2000	CCDSO	-		
California	September 2000	UKCGD	0.88	<u> </u>	_
California	September 2000	UKCGE	0.88	- -	
California	September 2000	ULPPX	5.85	_	
California	September 2000	UM3	0.61		
Illinois	April 2000	CXCT2	0.13 to 0.39	_	
Illinois	April 2000	CXCT2	0.13 to 0.39	_	اِ
Illinois	April 2000	CXCT2	0.13 to 0.39	_	<u>.</u>
Illinois	April 2000	U2FXC	various	_	
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07	_	<u>i</u>
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07	_)
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07	_	<u>.</u>
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07	_	3]
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07	_	3
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07	-	}
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07	_	<u>;</u>]
Illinois	December 2000	CXCT2	0.07		<u>)</u>